

Appin. No.: 09/924,858
Amendment Dated February 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2005

MATP-608US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-16 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-11 and 15-16 are allowed.

Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Naiff. This rejection is overcome by amending claim 12 to include,

directing data signals from one of the remote control transmitter or the keyboard to the data input port of the computer, exclusive of another one of the remote-control transmitter or the keyboard, responsive to the received select signal.

Basis for these amendments may be found at paragraphs [0025] to [0029] and in Figure 1. With regard to claim 1, Naiff does not disclose or suggest directing data signals from one of the remote control transmitter or the keyboard to the data input port of the computer, **exclusive of another one of the remote-control transmitter or the keyboard.** (Emphasis added). The invention in Naiff uses the computer 20 as a set top box. (Col. 5, lines 27-41). The user does not generate a control request signal because the user does not want to take control of the computer. As recited in the Abstract of Naiff, "the televisions operations take place in the multitasking environment of the PC, so that the PC can be concurrently used for other applications." The remote control is used to tell the computer to tune to a channel so the user can watch TV on the TV monitor. (Col. 6, lines 6-16). Thus, the user in Naiff does not select the computer to direct signals from **one of the remote control transmitter or the keyboard, exclusive of another one of the remote-control transmitter or the keyboard,** to the computer. (Emphasis added). Indeed, Naiff teaches away from exclusive control of the computer by the remote control or the keyboard as required by amended claim 12. Naiff et al. teach that the viewer can watch TV using signals provided by the computer while the computer is being used for other purposes. In Applicant's invention, the user uses the remote control transmitter to select entire control over the computer from either location. (Para [0026]). The user can then use the remote keyboard to control the entire computer or the keyboard at the computer station to control the entire computer.

Because Naiff does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 12, claim 12 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Naiff. Claims 13-14 depend from claim

Appln. No.: 09/924,858
Amendment Dated February 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2005

MATP-608US


12. Accordingly, claims 13-14 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Naiff.

Applicants appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claim 14 would be allowable if amended to be independent and to include all of the limitations of its base claims and any intervening claims. Because, as described above, claim 12 is in condition for allowance, no amendment to claim 14 is needed.

The prior art made of record but not applied has been considered but does not affect the patentability of the invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to claim 14 and the rejection of claims 12-13.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicants

KNN/pb

Dated: February 28, 2006

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (571-273-8300) on the date shown below.

February 28, 2006


Patricia C. Bocella

PCB_1\MATP\608US\02.28.06AMEND.DOC